

1  
2  
3  
4  
5           IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6           WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7           AT SEATTLE

8  
9           YVONNE ROUNTREE,  
10           Plaintiff,

11           v.  
12

13           MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a  
14           Washington corporation,  
15           Defendant.

16           Case No. C15-0760 RSM

17           ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
18           REOPEN

19           Plaintiff initially brought a Complaint against Microsoft, seeking millions of dollars in  
20           damages on the basis that it had apparently refused to remove her photos and information about  
21           prior arrests and jail time locate on the internet. On May 14, 2015, Defendant removed the  
22           instant matter from King County Superior Court to this Court. Dkt. #1. In so doing, Defendant  
23           noted that it had not yet been properly served, but that it had been made aware of the lawsuit  
24           when members of the Board of Directors received copies of the documents in the mail. *Id.* On  
25           June 8, 2015, Plaintiff filed a “Notice Contesting Validity of Removal” in which she stated that  
26           she was moving for reinstatement of her case to the Superior Court. Dkt. #4. The Court  
27           construed the Notice as a Motion to Remand, and directed Defendant to respond. Defendant  
28           filed its opposition to the motion and Plaintiff replied. Dkts. #6 and #7. The Court

29  
30           ORDER- 1

1 ultimately denied the motion. Dkt. #8. Defendant then moved to dismiss the case, which the  
2 Court granted on October 9, 2015. Dkts. #9 and #11. The dismissal was with prejudice, and  
3 the matter was closed.  
4

5 Plaintiff has now moved to reopen her case, apparently to add as new Defendants  
6 “Bing, Yahoo and Google, etc.” for their failure to remove her photos and prior arrest  
7 information from the internet, despite her multiple requests to do so. Dkt. #12.  
8

9 This case was previously dismissed with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil  
10 Procedure 12(b)(5) for insufficiency of service of process and under Federal Rule of Civil  
11 Procedure 12(b)(2) for lack of personal jurisdiction. Dkt. #11. Nothing in Plaintiff’s  
12 instant motion persuades the Court that it should reopen the matter to add new Defendants,  
13 nor does Plaintiff provide any legal authority requiring that the Court do so.  
14

15 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion to Reopen (Dkt.  
16 #12) is DENIED.  
17

18 DATED this 14th day of April, 2017.  
19

20   
21

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30